

CONVEYANCE TO BEAVER COUNTY, UTAH

NOVEMBER 10, 2005.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. POMBO, from the Committee on Resources,
submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H.R. 679]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on Resources, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 679) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey a parcel of real property to Beaver County, Utah, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 679 is to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey a parcel of real property to Beaver County, Utah.

BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR LEGISLATION

Minersville State Park is located on the shore of Minersville Reservoir along State Highway 21 between the towns of Beaver and Minersville, Utah. The Park is approximately 200 acres, 20 of which have the following improvements: campground facilities, a boat launch ramp, a park, a pavilion, an entrance station, and a maintenance building. The remainder of the property is either sagebrush rangeland or under water (depending on reservoir water levels). The Park was acquired from the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) with authority under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act (43 U.S.C. 869 et. seq.), which allows for the lease or purchase of BLM land typically for parks, schools, hospitals, community buildings and fairgrounds.

In April 2002, the Utah Division of Parks and Recreation Board notified Beaver County that the State was going to close the Park in June 2002 due to budgetary problems and the Park's loss of revenue (roughly \$90,000 per year). However, according to a warranty

deed for the property, if the State ceased to operate the facility as a state park the property would revert back to Beaver County. As such, on July 1, 2002, Beaver County took over management of the Park. Shortly thereafter, the County was notified that the warranty deed was invalid. Currently Beaver County is operating the Park with an informal agreement with the State.

H.R. 679 seeks to remedy the situation by conveying the property to Beaver County. With title to the land, the County will have the flexibility to manage the Park in an economically feasible manner. Without the conveyance, BLM will, by statute, require the State to remove all improvements to the Park.

COMMITTEE ACTION

H.R. 679 was introduced on February 9, 2005, by Congressman Chris Cannon (R-UT). The bill was referred to the Committee on Resources, and within the Committee to the Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health. On September 27, 2005, the Subcommittee held a hearing on the bill. On October 19, 2005, the Full Resources Committee met to consider the bill. The Subcommittee was discharged from further consideration of the bill by unanimous consent. No amendments were offered and the bill was ordered favorably reported to the House of Representatives by unanimous consent.

COMMITTEE OVERSIGHT FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Regarding clause 2(b)(1) of rule X and clause 3(c)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Resources' oversight findings and recommendations are reflected in the body of this report.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XIII

1. Cost of Legislation. Clause 3(d)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives requires an estimate and a comparison by the Committee of the costs which would be incurred in carrying out this bill. However, clause 3(d)(3)(B) of that Rule provides that this requirement does not apply when the Committee has included in its report a timely submitted cost estimate of the bill prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

2. Congressional Budget Act. As required by clause 3(c)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this bill does not contain any new budget authority, spending authority, credit authority, or an increase or decrease in revenues or tax expenditures.

3. General Performance Goals and Objectives. This bill does not authorize funding and therefore, clause 3(c)(4) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives does not apply.

4. Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate. Under clause 3(c)(3) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and section 403 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Com-

mittee has received the following cost estimate for this bill from the Director of the Congressional Budget Office:

H.R. 679—A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey a parcel of real property to Beaver County, Utah

CBO estimates that H.R. 679 would not significantly affect the federal budget. The bill would direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to Beaver county, Utah, for no consideration, approximately 200 acres of federal land in that county. The county currently manages that land as a park under a lease from the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). According to BLM, the land currently generates no significant receipts and is not expected to do so over the next 10 years. Therefore, CBO estimates that conveying it would not significantly affect offsetting receipts (a credit against direct spending). Enacting the bill would not affect revenues. Based on information from BLM, we also estimate that the agency's costs to complete the proposed conveyance would be minimal; any such costs would be subject to the availability of appropriated funds.

H.R. 679 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would impose no costs on state, local or tribal governments. Enacting this legislation would benefit Beaver County.

On February 23, 2005, CBO transmitted a cost estimate for S. 52, similar legislation, as ordered reported by the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources on February 16, 2005. The two bills are substantively similar, and our cost estimates are the same.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Megan Carroll. This estimate was approved by Peter H. Fontaine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

COMPLIANCE WITH PUBLIC LAW 104-4

This bill contains no unfunded mandates.

PREEMPTION OF STATE, LOCAL OR TRIBAL LAW

This bill is not intended to preempt any State, local or tribal law.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

If enacted, this bill would make no changes in existing law.

